REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 2 to 48 remain unchanged and claim 1 has been amended..

Amendment to the Claims

Allowance of claims 16 to 48 is gratefully acknowledged.

It is noted also that the Examiner considers claims 2 to 15 allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicant respectfully declines to rewrite these claims in independent form because it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable for the reasons given below.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ota (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,054). We respectfully submit that Ota does not disclose or indeed even suggest the invention claimed. The intention of claim 1 is to cover a method in which the transmission of LAN data is piggy-backed on top of information that is being transmitted in the form of optical frames in an optical transmission network. Thus, not only is there the transmission of information in optical frames as is conventional but there is also according to the method of the invention method steps which achieve the transmission of LAN data. The first step of this method is allocating in each frame of the optical transmission one or more bites for accommodating the LAN data transmission. In other words, in each optical frame one or more bites of the second plurality of bites which conventionally is used only for transmitting overhead is actually used to transit LAN data.

Ota, on the other hand, is not concerned with both transmitting information in optical frames and additionally piggy-backing LAN data by allocating in the overhead portion of each optical frame (second plurality of bites) one or more bites for LAN data transmission.

Ota is simply concerned with LAN transmission on its own. Figure 9 of Ota to which the Examiner referred, is a typical LAN packet in which there is a header and a payload (data body). It is noted that this configuration is similar to Ethernet frame 80 shown in Figure 4 of the present application. More particularly, the responding node address and the sending node address of Figure 9 of Ota correspond exactly to "DEST MAC" 84 and "SRC MAC" 86 in Figure 4. The invention to claim 1 involves taking this entire packet and inserting it into the overhead portion of the optical transmission frame. There is absolutely no suggestion of that in Ota. Moreover, the responding node address and the sending node address is not actually data but control information that determines where the data (in the payload) is sent.

Claim 1 has been revised slightly for clarity. More particularly, it is now stated explicitly that the transmission of the LAN data is additional to the transmission of information as recited in the preamble of the claim. In this way it should be clear that the transmission of the LAN data is different from and additional to the "information transmitted in frames" in the preamble of the claim.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

TREVOR D. CORKUM ET AL

By _____
James McGraw
Reg. No. 28,168
Tel.: 613 232 2486 ext. 310

Date: December 9, 2003

JMc/wfs